

REMARKS

The Applicant has reviewed the Examiner's Office Action, and believes that claims 1-8, as amended, are in condition for allowance. As a preliminary matter, the Applicant has cancelled claims 9-11 to limit the issues for consideration and provide for more efficient prosecution. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, as anticipated by patents to Housiaux, Ochiai, Abplanalp, Stanko, and Cabeza and further considers claim 8 obvious over Cabeza. In reviewing the applied patents, each of these patents includes outwardly projecting vanes on the tire sidewall. In contrast, claim 1, as amended, includes an inwardly indented wind catching feature that is recessed from the outer surface of the side wall. Consequently, based on this amendment, the Applicant believes that claims 1-7 are not anticipated by the applied patents.

Based on its dependency from claim 1, claim 8 is similarly believed to be in condition for allowance. Moreover, claim 8 contains independently patentable subject matter as it would not be obvious to include relatively smaller wind catching features in rows progressing radially inward of the outer features. The Examiner has argued that one of ordinary skill would provide progressively smaller features in order to cover the same surface area as the outer features, but one of ordinary skill would not necessarily be led to this configuration. In particular, to cover the same surface area, one could provide fewer features of the same size to cover the same circumferential area. Indeed, the Cabeza patent discloses uniformly sized vanes receiving a compressed air source to cause the rotation of the tire. Cabeza further discloses uniformly sized circumferentially offset vanes "so that air thrust...may be more continuous resulting in a more uniform rotating speed." Col. 2, Ln. 18-20. It is not an obvious design choice to create relatively smaller features on radial inward columns as it would not achieve the uniform rotating speed that Cabeza calls for. The primary rotational force in Cabeza is supplied by a jet nozzle over a small area and the uniformity that Cabeza teaches comes from the jet air interacting alternately with equal sized features in offset rows. If the features of radially inward rows were not of identical size the nozzle jet would not provide a uniform rotating speed as called for. Therefore, it is believed that the smaller radially inward

Application No.: 10/696,925
Reply to Office Action of March 23, 2004
Docket No.: TND.P.0001

features of the present application, which are supplied their thrust via outside air is not an obvious design choice and should therefore be placed in condition for allowance.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant believes that claims 1 - 8 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests notice of the same.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing in more detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

Respectfully submitted,



Shannon V. McCue, Reg. No. 42,859
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
First National Tower - Fourth Floor
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242
Facsimile: (330) 376-9646
E-mail: svmccue@rennerkenner.com

Attorney for Applicant(s)